

Dipterological Nomenclature.

By G. H. Verrall, Newmarket (England).

It is most unfortunate for Dipterology that a mania seems to have arisen for proposing new names for Genera upon the slightest suspicion of preoccupation. This has been especially noticeable with the genus *Psilopus*, in which author after author has taken it for granted that Meigen's generic name had been preoccupied. I have persistently retained the name for the Dolichopodidgenus, because I had no proof of any older use of the name. It is now stated that Poli's Molluscous name of 1795 was not used in a generic sense and that therefore after all Meigen's name can remain.

Latreille's genus *Ephippium* has been changed to *Ephippomyia* upon the vague statement that the word *Ephippium* had been used in some previously unrecorded work, but not the slightest effort has been made to test the supposed older generic term. Again *Clitellaria* (1803) has been proved to be older than *Ephippium*, because Schiner gave 1809 as the date of Latreille's foundation of his genus, but a very slight examination would have shewn that Latreille's genus was founded in 1802.

This year Prof. M. Bezzi in Heft II, p. 51 of this Magazine has dealt with several generic names in a most unfortunate manner.

1. **Cerochetus** A. M. C. Duméril (1816) 1823. This genus was founded by Duméril in Zool. Anal. 282 (1806), and until proved to be valid does not require to be amended to *Ceratochaetus*, a name which has already been used and which is therefore inadmissible.

2. **Ceyx** A. M. C. Duméril (1801). This genus cannot supersede *Calobata* until its original description is collated and then it will probably be found to have no species connected with the genus. Somebody has identified it with *Hydrophorus* but the figure in 1823 is unmistakably a *Calobata*.

3. **Chrysopsis** A. M. C. Duméril 1823. This mis-spelling was also used by Duméril in 1806.

4. **Cosmius** A. M. C. Duméril 1816. This genus was also proposed in 1806. Of course Klein's name — I will not call it genus — had no nomenclatorial value. Why must *Megaglossa* be amended to *Megaloglossa*? There are numerous Greek compound words beginning with only *Mega*, and all zoologists have heard of the *Megatherium*.

6. **Hexatoma**. 7. **Hypoleon**. 8. **Limonia**. 9. **Orthoceratium**. For my part I positively refuse to revive unnecessary names.

11. **Sargus** J. C. Fabricius. The inclusion of a name in an Index or Nomenclator is no proof of the existence of such a genus. Absolute proof is necessary first that a genus was properly founded, and I would go further and require proof that it existed as a valid genus at the time when the name was again used. I positively refuse to accept the name **Geosargus** in substitution of Fabricius' 109 years old genus without distinct proof of the valid existence of *Sargus* Klein 1792.

Latreille's genera *Aphritis*, *Gonyptes*, *Molobrus* and *Vappo* were not established until 1804.

I am also of opinion that all such proposed generic names as those given by Hendel on page 98 are merely »Catalogue Names«, because there is no evidence that Hendel knew anything about the validity of the genera for which he was proposing names, and surely a man cannot give a name to a genus he has never comprehended: he cannot know himself what he means by his own name and cannot describe it.

Meigen in 1803 gave no **types** for his genera: he only indicated previously described species which might possibly belong to his new genera. His names can only stand through his subsequent interpretation of them. No well known name should be altered until proved to be absolutely untenable.
